The Big Battleship Is Still Supreme

By Admiral GEORGE DEWEY, U. S. N.

THE BATTLESHIP IS STILL THE SUPREME FACTOR IN THE MODERN NAVY, AND THE POLICY OF THIS GOVERNMENT SHOULD BE THAT OF EVERY OTHER NATION—BUILD MORE BATTLESHIPS.

The torpedo craft cannot be relied upon; its radius of action is limited; it cannot do effective work in rough weather; it is liable to get out of order easily, and in the battle of the Sea of Japan these boats were not able to get close to the battleships until the latter had been VIRTUALLY DESTROYED and their secondary batteries rendered useless.

I have no doubt that those opposed to the building of battleships will try to extract arguments from the operations of the torpedo boats in the Korean strait. They will still claim that a battleship costing millions is at the mercy of a torpedo boat costing a few hundred thousand dollars. That sort of argument has been used for a century.

* * *

Away back in the beginning of the last century it will be remembered that Thomas Jefferson opposed the building of the big seventy-fours, and under his administration small gunboats WITH ONE GUN EACH were constructed. These lived in the memory of old naval officers as "Tom Jefferson's gunboats." I can remember the contempt with which Admiral Farragut referred to them on one occasion when I asked him about his father's service in the war of 1812. "Oh," he said, "he was at first put on a Tom Jefferson gunboat." These little vessels were ABSOLUTELY USELESS, as the United States found out to its sorrow when the British came up the Chesapeake.

There is one great lesson of the Togo-Rojestvensky battle which the United States and all maritime powers must take to heart, and that is the education and training of the crews of the warships. The failure of Rojestvensky can only be attributed to the lack of training of his officers and men. YOU CANNOT MAKE SAILORS AND GUNNERS WITHIN A YEAR. You must take ample time to educate your crews and you must require them to observe constant application.

AT MANILA THE GUNS OF THE SPANISH WERE EQUAL TO THOSE WE HAD AND SOME OF THEM LARGER, BUT IT WAS THE ACCURACY OF AIM AND THE DISCIPLINE OF THE CREWS THAT WON THE BATTLE SO FAR AS HUMAN POWER IS CONCERNED.

After our victory at Manila I said to my officers, "A higher power than us fought the battle." I observe in Togo's report that he also ascribes his wonderful victory to a higher power.

What Business Men Demand of Boys

By WILLIAM HOSEA BALLOU, Author and Sociologist

BOYS need, most of all, to be taught HOW to observe and study, to study things themselves, rather than the names of things; to acquire correct habits of thought, to investigate and DISCOVER FOR THEMSELVES what they wish to know. To this end it seems to me our schools are doing excellent work. But in what, if any, respects do they fail to meet the demands of BUSINESS men? In conversation with several men of large experience in my office and as I have met them in bank, counting room, at lunch and elsewhere I have put the question, "In your experience as a business man what sort of school training does a boy need?" The question applies, of course, only to boys untrammeled by requirements for admission to college. All were agreed that boys should leave school with a more thorough training in the RUDIMENTS OF EDUCATION, particularly in what used to be known as mental arithmetic.

If I may generalize, let me say, to sum up, that business men ask:

That our schools give boys a more practical training; that they guard against MENTAL INDIGESTION as we would against physical indigestion.

THAT SUCH TRAINING BE MORE THOROUGH, PARTICULARLY IN ARITHMETIC AND ACCOUNTS.

That more attention be given to English composition, spelling and penmanship.

That the school (and perhaps the home) teach the gospel of WORK, WORK, WORK! This lesson well learned will surely win promotion, give character, studying quality, persistence, stick-to-a-tiveness and, coupled with thrift, will enable ANY BRIGHT BOY to grapple with the problems of life and to climb ambition's ladder.

THE CAPE OF GOOD HOPE.

Some Facts Concerning It That Are Not Generally Known.

Though every schoolboy presumably knows to a nicety where the Cape of Good Hope is situated, there does undoubtedly prevail in less enlightened circles some vagueness of conception as to the exact locality of that celebrated headland. Even the gentle reader is faintly conscious of uncertainty and answers with a briskness not born of conviction: "The Cape of Good Hope? Why, of course I know where it is. Down at the end of South Africa." Gentle reader, you are not very far out, fifty or a hundred miles perhaps. And, as you say, it is not of the slightest consequence from a practical point of view.

The Cape of Good Hope lies at a considerable distance from the end and is, in fact, the middle of the three promontories, severally inconspicuous, which jointly terminate a slender peninsula, some twenty miles in length, forming the barrier between False bay and the Atlantic ocean on the west. These three headlands, lying near together and commonly undivided on a map of moderate scale, are locally designated Cape Point. It was here that Bartholomew Diaz first encountered in full force the prevalent southeasterly gales and denounced the rugged, threatening, threefold promontory under the sounding appellation of the Cape of Storms, to be afterward rechristened by pious, trustful hearts the Cape of Good Hope. The Cape of Storms, the Cape of Good Hope, Cape Farewell!

BIRTH OF THE WALTZ

THE DANCE HAD ITS ORIGIN EITHER IN FRANCE OR GERMANY.

Its Introduction Into England Caused a Great Scandal In That Country and For a Time Had Fashionable Society In an Uproar.

No exact date can be ascribed to the introduction of the waltz into England from France. In 1800 Gilray published a caricature of a couple waltzing, with the note that "this was intended for a quiz upon the then foreign dance, waltzing." Again in 1810 the same artist published another sketch, entitled "La Waise, Le Bon Genre," with the note, "The waise was at this time new in England and just coming into fashion."

The fame, or, rather, notoriety, of the new dance had, however, reached England some years previously. Dr. Burney had seen it danced in Paris in 1780 and was moved to write, "How uneasy an English mother would feel to see her daughter so unfamiliarly treated and still more to note the obliging manner in which the freedom is returned by the females."

Raikes in his journal declares that "no event ever produced so great a sensation in English society as the introduction of the German waltz," which he atttributes to Baron Neumann and others about the year 1811. He relates how the mornings, which had hitherto been dedicated to lounging in the park, were now absorbed at home in practicing the figures of a French quadrille or whirling a chair round the room to learn the step and measure of the German waltz.

It was danced at Almack's by a few very bold spirits, notably Lord Palmerston, Mme. de Lieven, Princess Esterhazy and Baron Neumann, and thus became a matter of exhibition, the whole company standing on benches to view the performance.

However, the antiwaltzing party took the alarm and cried it down. Mothers forbade it, and every ballroom became a scene of feud and contention. How profound was its unpopularity in certain quarters is proved by the pasquinades leveled against it. The famous

"What! The girl I adore by another embraced!"

are commonly attributed to Byron, though they were published anonymously in 1812, and some authorities give Thomas Moore as the author. An impromptu purporting to be addressed by an indignant lover to his betrothed and her partner echoes Byron's feelings:

You've brushed the bloom from the peach,
From the rose its soft hue;
What you've touched you may take.
Pretty waltzer, adieu.

Another poet delivered himself of the following diatribe:

How arts improve in this inspiring age!
Peers mount the box, and horses tread the stage,
While waltzing females, with unblushing face,
Disdain to dance but in a man's embrace.

"The waltz, however," continues Raikes, "struggled successfully through all its difficulties. Flaurhault, who was 'la fleur du pois' in Paris, came over and with a host of others drove the prudes into their intrenchments. And when the Emperor Alexander was seen waltzing around the roof at Almack's, with his tight uniform and numerous decorations, they surrendered at discretion."

It is a moot point whether the waltz originated in France or Germany, whether it came from the French "La Volta" or the German national dance, the "Landler." According to French authorities, La Volta was simply the waltz a trois temps. Provence was its birthplace, and it was first introduced at the court of Henry II. at Fontainebleau in 1555 by the Comte de Saulte, who is said to have invented it, for many called it La Volta de Saulte, and the name is suitable both because of the etymology of the word and the character of the dance.

It enjoyed a great run throughout France and even penetrated to Scotland, where it met with furious opposition, one writer averring that its importation into France had been effected by the power of witches. Mary Stuart once exhibited her agility in this dance, but she was careful not to repeat the experiment, and this was about the last heard of it.

The case for Germany is that the first waltz tune appeared in 1670 in a popular song called "O du lieber Augustin." From Germany the dance made its way to Vienna and was introduced into the opera, while by and by it found its way to France, whence it came to England—"the insidious waltz, this imp of Germany, brought up in France."

The waltz when first danced in London was a slow movement a trois temps, and the early English waltz compositions were very poor. Strauss came to London in 1837 to play at Almack's, and his waltz music created a perfect furore. It killed the old trois temps waltz, and the deux temps usurped its place. Now that the fascination of the waltz is all powerful, it is difficult to realize the commotion its introduction caused.—London Globe.